



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,400	12/19/2005	Alain Morel	21029-0304-US1	8987
30678	7590	09/29/2008	EXAMINER	
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP			KASTLER, SCOTT R	
1875 EYE STREET, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1100			1793	
WASHINGTON, DC 20006				
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		09/29/2008		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/553,400	MOREL, ALAIN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Scott Kastler	1793	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 4-9 and 13-18 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 4-9 and 13-18 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Means-Plus-Function Language in the Claims

Newly presented claim 18 contains the following terms recited in means-plus-function format and have been interpreted as follows:

- 1) "means for operating the lateral burners in bang bang mode" defined in the specification at page 6 as a computer.
- 2) "means for ordering the ignition of the burners" also defined in the specification at page 6 as a computer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-9 and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art of the instant disclosure in view of Giraud et al and Okamoto. The admitted prior art of the instant (pages 2 and 3 for example) disclosure teaches that it was known in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a process and furnace for controlling the temperature homogeneity in a reheat furnace equipped with lateral burners where the burners are operated in "bang bang" mode and the stoppage time is adjusted to obtain desired temperatures, thereby showing all aspects of the above claims except the use of spread flame burners as the lateral burners or igniting the burners in an order which promotes swirling in the flue gas where

the burner operation is controlled by a computer operatively connected to the furnace through sensors. Giraud et al teaches that in reheating furnaces it was known in the art at the time the invention was made to employ spread burners (12) as lateral reheat burners in order to further reduce temperature variations in a reheat furnace environment. Okamoto teaches that the use of computer controlled burners (see col. 4 lines 38-53 for example) fired in a controlled manner which would provide a swirling movement in the flue gases for optimum temperature distribution. Because even temperature distribution is an express objective of each of the above references, motivation to include spread burners as taught by Giraud et al as the burners of the admitted prior art of the instant disclosure, where the burner ignition and combustion is controlled in the manner recited by Okamoto in order to further provide optimal temperature distribution, would have been modifications obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 7/30/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's argument that Giraud and Okamoto are concerned with providing temperature homogeneity, while the instant claims are concerned with reducing hot points and are therefore distinct from the prior art this argument is not persuasive because firstly, improving temperature homogeneity is substantially the same as reducing hot points (non-homogenous temperature distributions), secondly this is not claimed in the instant claims, but rather independent claim 17 specifically recites that the process is for controlling temperature homogeneity. Finally, the instant claims are rejected over a combination of the admitted prior art

of the instant disclosure, Giraud and Okamoto, and as such cannot be overcome by arguing only against Giraud and Okamoto since one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicant's further argument that Okamoto is directed to a batch treatment process and not a continuously moving process is not persuasive because this limitation does not appear in the instant claims.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Kastler whose telephone number is (571) 272-1243. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Scott Kastler/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1793

sk